

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI
GREENVILLE DIVISION**

JERRY WAYNE ROLAND

PLAINTIFF

V.

NO. 4:20-CV-111-DMB-DAS

**HUMPHREYS COUNTY,
MISSISSIPPI, et al.**

DEFENDANTS

ORDER

On October 19, 2020, Jerry Wayne Roland, through counsel, filed a “Motion to Strike, Motion for Entry of Default Judgment, and Motion for Extension of Time to File Brief.” Doc. #18. Roland filed a memorandum brief in support of the motion on November 3, 2020. Doc. #24.

Roland’s motion and memorandum brief both fail in multiple ways to comply with the Local Rules of this Court. The eleven-page motion exceeds the four-page limit for motions mandated by Local Rule 7(b)(2)(B). In violation of the same rule, the motion contains legal argument and citations. The memorandum brief was filed approximately two weeks *after* the motion was filed, contrary to Local Rule 7(b)(4)’s requirement that the memorandum brief be filed at the time the motion is served.¹ Additionally, the memorandum brief is 42 pages long, which contravenes Local Rule 7(b)(5)’s 35-page limit for the movant’s initial *and* reply briefs.² Due to

¹ The motion includes a request for “an extension of five (5) days to file a Memorandum of Authorities in support of the instant motion.” Doc. #18 at 10. But that request is now moot because Roland’s supporting memorandum was not filed within the extension period requested, and Roland has not sought any further extension. Regardless, to the extent the motion requests an extension, the motion further fails to comply with Local Rule 7(b)(10) because it fails to advise whether the extension is opposed.

² Although Roland’s memorandum brief asks the Court to “excuse the page limit of the instant brief due to the number and complexity of the issue presented,” Doc. #24 at 42, the Court declines to acknowledge the request since it was not made by motion but rather in an untimely memorandum brief.

these failures to comply with the Local Rules,³ Roland's "Motion to Strike, Motion for Entry of Default Judgment, and Motion for Extension of Time to File Brief" [18] is **DENIED**.

SO ORDERED, this 9th day of November, 2020.

/s/Debra M. Brown
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

³ "Failure to timely submit the required motion documents may result in the denial of the motion." *See* L.U. Civ. R. 7(b)(4). And "[a]ttorneys practicing before the district courts of Mississippi are charged with the responsibility of knowing the Local Rules." L.U. Civ. R. Preamble.